

From: [Alex](#)
To: [Katie Brown](#); [Butler, David](#)
Cc: [Rebecca J. Dulin](#); [Heather Smith](#); [Grube-Lybarker, Carri](#); [Hall, Roger](#); [Knowles, Alex](#); [Samuel Wellborn](#); [fellerbe@robinsongray.com](#); [PSC Contact](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Commission Directive of February 3, 2021- Docket No. 2020-218-E - Kadoshnikov v. Duke
Date: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 7:31:34 AM

Let's start in the very beginning Mr Butler. I reached out and talked to very many people in the beginning before the complaint was ever filed with the Regulatory Staff. I can't count the hours, the lawyer in Greenville, Public relations in Greenville South Carolina. And I got nowhere. Why am I saying all this? Because Duke Energy says if it's in the public's interest to have this case go on, if the commission deems not, then to shut it down from my understanding.

Then in the once I the complaint was already official and some time went by, I again reached out to the head of the smart meter department and got the same answers showing me that Duke Energy did not want to resolve my issue. I contacted the lawyer in Greenville and was directed to the lawyers in Columbia and saw again that Duke Energy did not want to resolve the issue.

Until recently Duke Energy was confused as to the smart meter move and was falsely accusing me of moving my meter, and I recently again reached out to the lawyers in Columbia and asked them point blank, what their issue was and why they were falsely accusing me. Now Katie kindly replies that the meter was moved at the request of Alex, not mentioning the fact that it was I that again reached out. Not only that Mr. Butler but I offered to close this case if they wanted too. They refused, the lawyer representing them was the most down to earth individual that I have meet, it's his clients that act in the way they act and it for the commission to look at who has taken steps to go toward them, and what steps they have taken at getting closer to a resolution, as well as the public reading this because it is in their best interest from everyone that I have talked to from lawyers to judges to police officers, to countless others, they are all outraged, could not believe that Duke Energy is getting away with this.

Not only that Mr. Butler but when contacting customer care about finding out my bill like talked about in my other bill, the customer service representatives contradicted themselves. First off telling me that I may have a second meter and that is why my bill is an addition 55 Kilowatts hours. Then I was informed that everything is calculated at the end of the month and therefore they could not provide me with daily usage.

I have been so grateful to the Regulatory Staff, because if there is someone to help answer questions and be beyond professional it is them. It took Mr. Campbell coming out to my residence with Duke Energy to get my answer to being able to see my meter reading and hourly usage by going online and registering and setting up an account. Thank you to everyone at the Regulatory Staff from the incredible Director, to Brad Kirby, to Mr. Campbell with whom I've spoken and all have been beyond helpful.

Mr. Butler you see all the steps that I have taken to resolve this issue at hand. Let the commission consider this. I would like an answer to my previous questions addressed to you and also if this case does concern the smart meter issue as a whole and if the commission deems it "of public interest" for them to consider investigating it fully. If this is the case I ask for all the paper work that Duke Energy filed about this new technology to get it approved and let's see if it matches up with what I have personally delivered to the commission. I want to go through line by line and if they have committed fraud by not disclosing what this technology really does, then I ask that they be held accountable, and also held accountable for accusing me of moving my meter (as stated above, I reached out and asked what issue they had with the meter move, not Duke Energy).

Thank you so much for your time Mr. Butler, and for doing what is right and trying to come to a resolution, may God richly bless you, and the Public Service Commission as they look into this matter further.

With deep respect,
Alex.

On Monday, March 1, 2021, 05:20:07 PM EST, Butler, David <david.butler@psc.sc.gov> wrote:

Thank you.
David Butler

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2021, at 4:26 PM, Brown, Katie <Katie.Brown2@duke-energy.com> wrote:

David,

To your question as to whether Mr. Kadoshnikov's meter can be relocated, upon the request of Mr. Kadoshnikov, the meter was relocated by the Company in September 2020.

Thank you,

Katie Brown

Katie M. Brown

Counsel

Duke Energy

C: 864.590.7407

From: Butler, David <David.Butler@psc.sc.gov>

Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 9:36 AM

To: Dulin, Rebecca Jean <Rebecca.Dulin@duke-energy.com>; Smith, Heather Shirley <Heather.Smith@duke-energy.com>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri <clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; a111e1x@yahoo.com; Knowles, Alex <aknowles@ors.sc.gov>; Brown, Katie <Katie.Brown2@duke-energy.com>; Samuel Wellborn <swellborn@robinsongray.com>; fellerbe@robinsongray.com

Cc: PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Commission Directive of February 3, 2021- Docket No. 2020-218-E - Kadoshnikov v. Duke

***** CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER *** STOP & THINK! Do you know and trust this sender? Were you expecting this email? Are grammar and spelling correct? Does the content make sense? If suspicious, then do not click links, open attachments or enter your ID or password.**

To the Parties:

Good morning. As you all may know by now, I have been appointed Hearing Officer in this Docket to aid the Commission by working with the parties on procedural matters in the Docket.

First, I wanted to correct one particular misunderstanding for the Complainant. His direct testimony has not been stricken at this point in the case, although the Motion to Strike by Duke is still pending. This Hearing Officer cannot provide legal advice to any party. The parties are well served in many cases by being represented by counsel who can answer legal questions, as are some parties in this case. However, I would point out that, for procedural matters, the Commission has developed a Pro Se Litigants Guide that may be found on the Commission's website. This guide answers many of the common questions that come up for an individual representing themselves in a case before the Commission. In any case, the Motion to Strike the Complainant's testimony is still pending, and a decision is yet to be made on it. I would note that Duke has pointed out what the Company believes are deficiencies with the testimony, and the Complainant has filed a response, all of which will be addressed at a later time, if necessary.

For the present, however, I wanted to explore one pathway that would seem to solve the problem stated in the Complaint, if accepted by the Complainant. Duke had stated in its Petition for Reconsideration of December 31, 2020 that it is feasible to relocate the Complainant's meter. The Petition for Reconsideration noted that this option was offered to the Complainant, but that the option was rejected by him.

Having stated these principles, I would ask two questions of the parties:

1. Does Duke still believe that it is feasible to relocate Mr. Kadoshnikov's meter?
2. If this is still feasible, would Mr. Kadoshnikov be amenable to this solution?

Duke and the Complainant should further discuss this option, if appropriate.

If, after conferring if necessary, the answers to both questions are in the affirmative, then it would appear that the complaint could be resolved, without further proceedings at the Commission. I would ask that the parties further consider this matter, and answer these questions and direct a response to this Hearing Officer (with copies to all parties) on or before Monday, March 1, 2021.

If the parties cannot reach agreement, then the Complaint matter must continue before the Commission. I would note that this Complaint action has so far not yielded any solutions for any of the parties, and the procedural matters, such as the Motion to Strike must be still be dealt with. The results of the decision on this Motion may not be satisfactory to one or more of the parties. If the matter is still viable after the ruling on the Motion to Strike, the Commission could certainly hold a hearing. However, the result of such hearing would be, of course, unknown at this point. If the parties could settle the matter as described, an agreement may be reached that could yield satisfactory results to both sides in a timely manner. I would ask the Parties to consider these matters very carefully. I would point out that, as many of you know, I cannot by law discuss this matter as Hearing Officer with just one of the parties in the absence of the other parties. If it is deemed helpful, I can hold a telephone conference call at the convenience of all parties, if so requested.

Thank you for your consideration in these matters.

Regards,

David Butler

Chief Hearing Officer